THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI) : The other has not been circulated.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It can be circulated straightway.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : In the meantime he can go on reading the first statement.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

I. Signing of three agreements including the extradition treaty between India and UAE

II. Recent visit of United States Secretary of Energy to India

THE MINISER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH) : Sir the U.A.E. Minister for Justice, Islamic Affairs and Awqaf, H.E. Mr. Mohammed Bin Nakhira al Dhaheri, accompained by an official delegation, visited India on October 25-26, 1999.

During the visit, an Extradition Treaty, an Agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters and an Agreement on Juridical and Judicial Cooperation in Civil and Commercial matters between India and the UAE, were signed.

The extradtion Treaty would provide a legal framework for seeking the extradition of fugitive criminals including those involved in terrorism and economic offences from either country. Under the Treaty, extradition would be possible irrespective of whether the crime was committed before or after the entry into force of this Treaty.

The Agreement on Juridical and Judicial Cooperation in Civil and Commercial Matters aims to facilitate the widest measure of legal assistance in pursing such cases. As a result of this Agreement, it will be possible to serve summons and other judicial documents issued by the courts of one country in the territory of the other. The judicial authority of one country could also, at the request of the other, take evidence. Further, the courts of one country would also be able to execute decrees and arbitration awards passed in the territory of the other.

The Agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters aims to strengthen the cooperation between the two countries in the completion of investigation and prosecution in respect of all crimes, including those related to terrorism. It would provide the basis for seeking assistance for tracing, restraint, forfeiture or confiscation of the proceeds and instruments of crime. The Agreement will also facilitate the widest measure of mutual assitance in

the service of summons, execution of warrants and other judicial documents and commissions.

Thus the three Treaties embody the desire of the two countries to make more effective the bilateral cooperation by taking concrete steps with a view to combat terrorism and other crimes.

Sir, now, I pass on to the other statement.

The Unites States Secretary of Energy, Mr. Bill Richardson visited Delhi on 26th October.

Secretary Richardson addressed a CII Conference on Energy, Efficiency and Environment, and interacted with a number of business and industry leaders.

His official programme included meetings with the minister of Power, Minister of Environment and Forests and Minister of External Affairs. Delegation legel talks were held with representatives of all the concerned Ministries and chaired by the Minister of External Affairs.

Secretary Richardson also called on the Prime Minister and handed over a letter from President Clinton addressed to PM.

Cooperation in energy and related matters has been an important component of our bilateral relations with the United States. The purpose of Secretary Richardson's visit was to review as well as to provide a renewed thrust to our cooperation in energy and related environmental matters, in a more integrated and focused manner. The visit provided an opportunity for substantive discussions on these aspects.

We welcome this visit by Mr. Richardson, which is part of the on-going process of developing a broad-based relationship with the United States, and expanding and diversifying areas of bilateral cooperation for mutual benefit.

During the visit, a joint statement on cooperation in energy and related environmental aspects was signed. I do not know if rules permit. Otherwise, if you permit, Sir, copies of these joint statements will also be laid on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Yes, It is a good thing.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Copies of the joint statements are laid on the Table of House. These are the two statements, Sir. I will be happy to address whatever queries the hon. Members might have on both, or either, of these statements. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Mr. Eduardo Faleiro, your name is there.

SHRI S. RAMA CHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Sir, we have given our names ealrier.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): No, I have got only three names here. At the first instance, I am asking Mr. Eduardo Faleiro to put his questions. Mr. Falerio, are you seeking clarifications on both the statements?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Yes, Sir.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Sir, I would be seeking clarifications with respects to the first statement.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, I have given notice for seeking clarifications on both the statements and I will make it very short and consolidated. I must first congratulate the minister because this matter has been hanging fire for many years, and finally, we have now signed it. But merely signing the Extradition Treaty is not going to solve the problem. There are few more things that must be done. Now, I recall that just a couple of years ago, there was a man who cheated one of the Emirs in UAE. This happens quite often. He cheated and came running back to India, went to Kerala, filed a case against himself and got an order from the Magistrate that he cannot be sent out of Kerala or out of India. In the meanwhile, that Emir met the Ambassador, and the Ambassador told him that he would get that man back for him. But he could not do that because our legal system is very different from their legal system. We function differently. The Emir could not understand that and there was a lot of misunderstanding as a result of this situation. Therefore, merely signing the Extradition Treaty will not solve the problem. There must be a harmonization of both the systems. This cuts the other way round also. This cuts in this way. The people from my State, from the State of my colleague, Shri Vayalar Ravi, and from the States of many other hon. Members, work in the Gulf often, as domestic servants. Now, I have cases of harassment of maids who worked there, in the Gulf. They are not paid their dues. Then, you see, the person comes here without the money. Now, many countries like Sri Lanka are singing MOUs, the Memoranda of Understanding with other countries so that this question of payment of dues to these people is settled in a fair manner. I would like to know whether the Government will also sign such MOUs? I have raised two points. Firstly, will you work for harmonizing both the legal systems so that the Extradition Treaty becomes a useful instrument? Secondly, will you sign the Memorandum of Understanding on the lines of Sri Lanka and other countries that export labour to the Gulf so that the question of dues and other things is settled expeditiously? Thirdly, these poor people of ours, from my States and from many other States are not getting the necessary assistance from our missions. We have labour

attaches, we have woman ambassadors. Many of them are extremely effective. I have the honour of serving in this Ministry which is now presided over by Mr. Jaswant Singh, the hon. Leader of the House today. I know that many of them are really working with great dedication but there are some who do not do what is expected of them. They should be active in helping our people, not aggressive. Number three on the first statement, what are you going to do to see that our Heads of Missions are more motivated towards helping this segment of our population which is poor and helpless, and particularly how will you activate our labour divisions or labour attaches in these particular countries? This is on the first statement.

On the second statement, I will be equally brief. While addressing myself to the concerns, which are American concerns, which are Indian concerns, from the U.S. point of view they want us to sign the CTBT. Now we have named a resolution of Parliament during Prime Minister Gujral's time. But we can't do that. At the same time, our representative, if I am not mistaken, at Geneva Conference on Disarmament had said, "As far as CTBT is concerned, we shall not sign it." I quote: "Not now, not ever". Now we have an additional element. The United States themselves have not ratified it. This is wonderful. I would say that it must be a priority of our country to strengthen relations with the United States. In the Unipolar world it is a must for this reason and for many other reasons, but it cannot be at the cost of our national interests. Our Foreign Police is all for our national interests. Therefore, in this context, what is your position on the CTBT, I mean, the position in the context of what we have said earlier for the last 50 years and what the Americans themselves are doing in respect of this Treaty? May I know at what stage the Jaswant Singh-Talbott negotiations are? What is the progress made? When are you meeting and what are the objectives of the negotiations? I got the impression that the Americans wanted us—and I don't think it is a wrong impression—to cap our missile technology. They wanted us to stop that. What is your position on that?

The third American concern is WTO. They want us to just passively shake our heads and support them at the Seattle Round of negotiations on the world trade. Now the lady US Deputy State representative, Susan Esserman, is coming here next Monday, two days from now. And I was surprised to read what she had to say to the Indian correspondents in Washington just this week. She said this to the Indian correspondents in Washington early this week and I quote: "This is an ideal month"—as far as coming to India is concerned. And I quote: "With Indian Government committed to reforms and the US and India, for the first time a real convergence of interests about the WTO." Now, that is something wonderful, showing 1, and also a bit makes us think how it is that India which has such different economic parameters, and the U.S., which is rooted in a different economic world,

have this sudden convergence of interests. "Convergence of interests." What are the implications of this? What type of convergence is this? I would urge the Government to be very firm on our interests which are quite different from the American interests. We must work with them, I repeat, but not at the cost of our interests. We must work with them, we must strengthen our relations with the USA, but not at the cost of our economic interest or any other interests.

And I suppose, that is all I would like to say. I request the Minister to kindly clarify these points. (ends)

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (DELHI): Sir, it is a matter of satisfaction that the Government has signed this Treaty of Extradition and other related matters with the Government. The Government deserves to be congratulated on that subject. I would like to seek some clarification, some elaboration on related matters. We have the Extradition Treaty, I understand, with less than 30 countries. Actually, there are more than 150 States in the world. Will it not be good to have this Extradition Treaty with all these countries? Would the Government consider this matter to have its Extradition Treaty with as many countries as possible as our interests require it?

Secondly, we have this Extradition Treaty with 30 odd countries. How well will Treaty work? How many applications have come to us from these countries; and how many applications and requests have gone from this country to those countries? What has been the response? What has been the success rate? Are there any problems? Is the procedure too dilatory, or, too slow? I know that this information may not be readily available with the hon. Minister, but I would suggest that a comprehensive note on the subject may be prepared and sent. Thank you.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (TAMIL NADU): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, regarding the Treaty, with the U.A.E., I would like to raise only two points. Firstly, most of our workers are manual workers. Some agents in our country send these workers abroad for employment, through an agreement. But when they reach the other country, that agreement is actually flouted or broken. A number of people from Tamil nadu and Kerala are going abroad for manual work. As a result of this, the foreigners are cheating many people. I would like to know whether action will be taken under this Treaty against those flouting the agreement.

Secondly, many maidservants from the South are going abroad for employment. After they get appointment, we invariably get the message that they are being ill-treated there. I don't want to explain this in an explicit manner. The hon. Members know that when they are ill-treated, that also comes under the purview of the criminal code. All the workers and maidservants are suffering

because of the criminal activities of the foreigners. Therefore, I would like to know whether this Treaty will cover those cases and bring the people, who inflict harm against the Indians, to book.

As far as energy and environment is concerned, what I understand, as a layman, is that environmental pollution has taken place because the developed countries are not in favour of the developing countries. I would like to know whether any talks regarding this issue have been held or not. The environmental problems are created not only by the developing countries, but also by the developed countries. In case any interaction has taken place regarding this, we would like to be enlightened about this.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I would like to congratulate the government on this Agreement in regard to the three Treaties with the U.A.E., more particularly, because the idea behind this Treaty is that there should be bilateral cooperation for tackling terrorism and other crimes. Sir, I would like to know from the Minister whether the Government will be able to do anything under this Treaty to bring back to India those people who have committed crimes; who are responsible for the series of bomb blasts in Bombay and who are not supposed to be residing in India. I do not want to name them. But there is nothing to fear. People like Dawood Ibrahim and others have created a nightmare for the people of this country. Will it cover that? Will the Government be able to get them back to India and try them in a court of law?

Secondly, as other Members have raised, a lot of people, even from Andhra Pradesh, are going there as maidservants, for their livelihood. Many of them are not only being ill-treated there, but they are being cheated also. Most of them are illiterates. They go there through middlemen. What happens is that the people there float a company and they have a Branch in Mumbai, or, some other place, i.e., Thiruvananthapuram, or, Chennai. So, the original people are there in those places.

Will this Treaty be sufficient to take action in such cases? Or, will the Government need to go in for some other memorandum of understanding, as raised by Faleiroji and others? Is the Government thinking on these lines to get these things included in this? Or, will you take the initiative to have a sort of new understanding about this particular problem which was raised by Members from all sections of the House? Thank you.

SHRI GOPALSINH G. SOLANKI (Gujarat): Sir, first of all, I congratulate the Government for having entered into an Extradition Treaty. But the Treaty will definitely involve some questions of law. If we want to bring the criminals from abroad, we will have to empower the investigating agencies also. It is not easy to trace those people who have escaped from India. At the same time the law of that land would also be different from ours. I would

like to know from the hon. Minister whether any attention has been paid to the aspect of amending the law in order to bring the criminals, such as those who were involved in the Bombay riots and all that. Thank you.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I welcome the Treaty. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister, through you, Sir, to a particular point. I don't know whether there is a similar treaty with Sweden or not. A news report has come today that the Swedish Government has stated that in no case are they going to extradite Mr. Martin Ardbo, one of the prime accused in the Bofors case. There is another statement, not from any Government, but from Mr. Quattrochhi, another prime accused in the Bofors case, that he would never allow himself to be interrogated in India. He can be interrogated elsewhere. But the other statement is from the Swedish Government that Mr. Martin Ardbo will in no case be extradited to India. He is one of the prime accused in the Bofors case. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this.

As regards the second statement, in the second para there is a mention about Mr. Bill Richardson, the United States Secretary of Energy's address at a CII Conference on Energy,, Efficiency and Environment. I accuse the Minister of making a statement, at the same time, conveniently suppression certain facts about this conference. The fact, as reported in the Press, is that the Minister is supposed to have the 9th round of parleys with Mr. Talbott in the US on CTBT, non-proliferation treaty and other current issues. They have been taken up with the United States in the last few months. Mr. Bill Richardson came at the invitation of our Government and this seminar was organized by our Government. He was not ashamed of making certain comments in this seminar, which goes against any kind of protocol. He said in that seminar that he had pressurized the Government to sign the CTBT, that India had to stop production of fissile material and that all assistance from the United States would depend on that. This has not been mentioned in the statement. Though it didn't come through because of certain other developments which took place within the Senate of the United States subsequently, he made this kind of an utterance in the seminar, which he attended at the invitation of the Government, where you were present. My question is, whether this point was properly replied to or not. It is beyond his protocol. I would like to know from the Minister whether he or the Government or the officials concerned had conveyed to them correctly the displeasure of our nation at the kind of statements made by him. Thank you.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: Sir, my questions are confined to the second statement. With regard to this issue, India as well as other developing countries are taking a consistent stand. In 1992, in the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, we along with the developing countires took a

stand that it was the primary responsibility of the developed countries, particularly the United States of America, to meet the major share of expenses. If we look at the population of the United States, which is only 5 per cent of the world population, its energy consumption is more.

7.00 P.M.

They are consuming 25% of the energy produced in this world and emitting about 22% of the carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. So, we have been taking a consistent position that the major share of this adjustment should be borne by the Unites States of America and the developed countries. We have been resisting to sign KYOTO mechanism, or, KYOTO protocol. Of course, the US Secretary of Energy, Mr. Bill Richardson, himself had admitted that there were differences with India on this issue. Now the Government has agreed to this. What are the compulsions? What are the differences? I would like to know whether the United States of America has agreed with our concern.

My second question is also with regard to this only. I would like to know whether this changed position of ours will have any implications on our relations with the developing countries because we can resist the attempt of America, we can protect the interests of our country, only with united efforts of the developing countries. We have been doing this exercise from 1992 onwards. Now, all of a sudden, we have changed this position and signed this protocol. Will it have any implications on our relations with the developing countries? Has the signing of the Protocol any connection with the lifting of some of the sanctions imposed by the American President?

The other issue which has been raised by my hon'ble friend, Mr. Faliero, is that we have been taking a consistent position that we should not sign the CTBT which is meant to protect the supremacy as well as the monopoly of the nuclear powers. So, we have been taking a consistent position not to sign this. There is also a coercive element in the present atmosphere that these sanctions are there and America is adopting the carrot-and-stick policy. Of course, I am actually taken abvack to see the statement made by Mr. Bill Richardson. While negotiating on this, he also spoke to the Press. Already Mr. Clinton has signed a Bill, which enables him to lift these sanctions. So, on the one hand, they are imposing sanctins; on the other hand, they are showing the carrot. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any change in our perception with regard to the consistent stand on CTBT, i.e., not to sign it, as it is discriminatary and meant to protect the supremacy and monopoly of the nuclear powers.

The other aspect is this. On Wednesday, the American President has lifted the sanction,s selectively. Their lifting of sanctins, according to me, is done, keeping in view their overall interest. Now, while responding to this selective

lifting of the sanctions, I am sure India is taking ample are to protect its national interest.

On of the news items which I read in the paper is about the Interantional Military Educatio and Training. Immediately after Pokharan II tests, there was a total ban. Now, they have lifted it. Considering the internatinal experience of the dangers of entering into this sort of military education and training the Americans, I would like to konw the reactio of this Government to this selective lifting of the sanctions.

DR. (MRS.) JOYASREE GOSWAMI MAHANTA (Assam): Sir, I would like to invite the kind of attention of the hon. Minister of External Affairs to the second paragraph in the second page of his statement. It says: "The agreement on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters aims to strengthen the co-operation between the two countries in the completio of investigatio and prosecution in respect of all crimes including those related to terrorism." I would like to cite only one instance. About one-and-and-a-half years back, a ship, which was carrying some arms and ammunition, was caught in the Diamond Harbour, West Bengal. It was published in newspapers that the weapons were to be transported to the terrorist groups of the North-Eastern region. Sir, I would like to invite the kind attention of the hon. Miniser to this incident, and I would urge upon him that this matter should be considered during the discussions o the treaty, so as to restore peace and amity in the North-Eastern region, especially Assam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): Mr. Minister, it is not a directive from the Chair. But I would want know one thing from you. So far as artsicle 253 is concerned, namely, Treaties and Agreements, in the matter of individual rights, all treaties should be brought in in the nature of legislation. This is what I want to know.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I forgot to ask one thing. I mentioned about the American concern. I forgot to mention about the Indian concern. I would just mention about one Indian concern. What is the position on the restrictions? When and what are the restrictions that have been removed? Is the restriction on transfer of hight technology, particularly, dual technology, from the U.S. to India being removed? This is matter of great concern to India.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH Mr. vice-Chairman, Sir, I will attempt to answer your question also.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to clarify both the statment as also the Government's position in this regard. Naturally, when such statements of some significance on international relations are made, understandably, the hon. Members would like to seek clarifications.

Hon. Shri Eduardo Faleiro wanted to know about harmonization of laws. Now, harmonization of laws between the U.A.E. and India would be difficult, as India has Extradition Treaty with 14 countries. We are, currently, negotiationg to extend this with another 26 countries. As regards the Treaty with 26 other countries, the negotiations are in various stages. But, as you would appreciate, this is mutual thing. As regards harmonization, I would like to inform the hon. Member that harmonization would be difficult because in the Extradition Treaty covering 14 different countries, the jurisprudence of national laws also come in. Let me explain; what an extradition treaty will grant us is, the application of the lawss of the respective nations, and being tried, if necessary, within that nation, and the extradition of the criminal, if we want. An Indian national in the Emirates, for example, can then be tied in he Emirates, sentenced, and then extradited to India And that we agree to work within the parameters of our respective laws, but work jointly together is the actual harmonization that takes place.

On whether we would have a Memorandum of Understanding, particularly the reference to labour aspect that has been raised by a number of hon. Members, with your permission, Sir, I would answer all the labour questions in one attempt. We have almost 1.2 million Indians today working in the United Arab Emirates, which is a large number of people. I might be slightly wrong on the exactness of the figures. But in the Emirates, 280 odd cases are under trial. The cases of cheating, etc. were cited. Now, all these people can be tried. An hon. Member wanted to know about the Bombay Blasts cases. Yes, they are very much within the purview of this and are indeed, now extraditable and chargeable. That is why I am grateful that the Members will appreciate the significant advance that these three treaties represent in relation to the UAE.

On labour proper, we do regularly engage with the Gulf countries on labour matters, including at the level of the Joint Commission with these countries. We have these treaties with the Emirates now. But we have signed a MoU on labour cooperation with Qatar. We are pursuing it with the other countries in the region as well. The Gulf countries have assured us of the concern that we have regarding the welfare of the Indian community that goes to work there.

Now, on the question of the breaking and flouting of contracts, sadly, it is correct, Sir, and the hon. Members are right; it happens, and happens with a frequency which I would frown upon and rather not have. But we take every incident seriously. And the Ministry is now going to propose enforcing prior attestation of contract documents that have been suspended for some time now.

On mistreatment of labour, whether it be domestic servants or maids, etc, this matter is regularly pursued in the local courts. The Embassy officials are involved in all such matters. But I take what the hon. Members said that our Missions abroad should be more pro-active. I think this really answers the labour part of the question that a number of Members have asked and I would not repeat it.

There was a question, particularly, from the hon. Member, Shri Ramachandra Pillai. May I request the hon. Member to kindly not charge me with falsehood in Parliament? He suggested that I stated a falsehood in Parliament and that what I said here was incorrect or that I had kept back anything. I have been long enough in these Assemblies, in this House and the...

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRA PILLAI: I haven't said it.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: Sir, I said 'suppressing'...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Well, 'suppressing' amounts to falsehood. I don't suppress information, Sir. And I have come here voluntarily.

Anyway, let me answer your query. We don't have an extradition treaty with Sweden. Secondly, in the matter of Mr. Ardbo, we will be taking it up with Sweden, no matter what Sweden says or Mr. Ardbo says or what the strange Italian gentleman, Mr. Quattrochi, says because we do have an extradition treaty with Malaysia and we are acting on that...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: If he flees from Malaysia, then what happens because the Government has changed in Malaysia?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No Sir, in this case, because you have asked me the question, in the case of this particular person, we have taken the precaution of issuing a red alert through the Interpol. The Interpol has already issued a red alert. So, should this person wish to leave Malaysia, the Interpol comes into play. The red alert is on. I provided this information only because you asked. We have already moved the Malaysian Government for his extradition.

Sir, a number of hon. Member asked certain question relating to this. It is, firstly, not a protocol that has been signed with Mr. Richardson, who is the Energy Secretary, it is a joint statement that has been issued, and it is similar. I have laid a copy of this on the Table of the House. Firstly, on the broad three questions that come, Sir, one is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; the second is on WTO; and the third relates to environmental matters and sanctions. These are the broad heads under which questions on the statement made about Mr. Richardson's visit have been made, with the exception of what hon. Faleiro inquired about whether there was any

pressure at any time on us to cap the missile programme that we have. I have said it earlier in the House, and I have no difficulty in saying it again, India does not act under pressure.Whatever the demands from whichever country might or might not have been, the manner in which the Ministry of External Affairs has attempted to fulfil its responsibility is to reject any suggestion — even of a pressure — from any quarter. Pressure is out of the question. This is too large a country, too great a country, to be pressurised by anyone. As for capping the missile programme, the question does not arise. We have made it clear. I have stated it in the House that it is the Integrated Missile Development Programme which is public; it is part of our annual budgetary processes, it is part of the exercise that has been going on for some time, and India's Integrated Missile Development Programme shall continue as announced, without any deviation or change. That position is clear.

Sir, I am sorry I gave a false information about the extradition treaty with Malaysia. We don't have a bilateral extradition treaty. We are going to operate through the Interpol. Assistance has been sought already through diplomatic channels with Malaysia, under the laws of Malaysia, and we are fulfilling those laws. But the information that I gave about red alert on the Interpol is correct.

On WTO; yes; Sir, because, as hon. Pranab Mukherjee mentioned earlier in the day, we don't wish to repeat the mistakes of the Uruguay Round, and we are engaging in talks, not simply with the United States of America, but also with the European Union, also with Japan. Indeed, it is India that has taken the initiative. To answer your query in part, Sir, with the G-15 or the G-77; we are constantly attempting to keep the developed countries involved in this. And when I say we are attempting to find a harmonisation of points for the Millennium Round or the Seattle Meeting, if Ms. Susan Esserman has spoken of convergence, we have also made it quite clear, as recently as in the Geneva Meeting of 25th and 26th where the hon. Minister of Commerce along with the delegation was present; for example, on labour or on environment or on agricultural items, there is simply no seeing the point of convergence of views between the United States of America and India, and, indeed, some other countries. There may be convergence in some other areas. We are attempting to find an agreement in certain areas. There is no agreement at the cost of the national interest. I have said so in my intervention yesterday; very soon, the hon. Prime Minister will be convening a meeting with the entire leadership of the Opposition, at his convenience and at the convenience of the Opposition, to sit with them and to discuss the entire WTO aspect of the Seattle round. I might reassure you, Sir, that on the question of India not providing a support base to the developing world, India continues to support. Let me clarify, Sir, and I have clarified often—on

the question of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the position of the Government remains unaltered and unambiguously the same, as stated by the Prime Minister in Parliament on 15th December, 1998, and as mentioned in the UN General Assembly. On that, there is absolutely no ambiguity whatsoever.

We are attempting to build a widest possible consensus in this regard. When we meet next, we can have a fullest discussion in this regard. We are participating in the Missile Material Treaty Negotiation and the Conference on Disarmament. We are participating as equal partners. India has an impeccable record in export control. In fact, the export control record is much better than the record of some of the P-5 countries themselves.

A question was asked whether there was some kind of a linkage between Mr. Richardson's visit and the issuance of the statement. Let me first clarify that we are trying to cooperate in energy matters with the U.S. and with other countries. I have been travelling to Central Asian countries with a view to ensuring energy security for the country. This energy cooperation is on the terms that meet our national interest. I will not shy away from seeking energy cooperation from any country, be it Turkmenistan, be it Iran or be it the USA, because we are an energy thirsty country and we need to fill that gap very urgently. A lack of energy is an absence of sufficient energy security for the country. It has nothing at all to do with the actions that have been taken by President Clinton in Washington, almost at the same time. Mr. Richardson coming here, holding talks with us, addressing the CII meeting, were all a part of an old established programme which was fulfilled. The aspect that should be noted is that, after the May, 1998 tests and the UN Security Council's Resolution 1172, this is the first visit by a Cabinet level dignitary from the USA to India. That, in itself, is a message; and the visit has taken place without India having moved from where it was when the May tests took place.

As far as the sanctions and their implications are concerned, a question was asked. I still have to receive the authorised text of the sanctions and I do not wish to go by what has appeared in the Press, though I have received reports of it from the Missions. We are studying the full implications of the US sanctions. What has taken place is a partial exercise of the waiver authority and it restores the position that obtained before October 21, 1999 when the waiver authority under the earlier US legislation expired. The US Congress had granted these powers, to waive the sanctions to the United States of America for one year and that waiver expired on 21st. I am putting it across as simply as I can whatever power was extended to the President of the United States of America; he has exercised the waiver for one more year. This would enable commercial transactions between private banks as well as

transactions related to the US Trade Authority Development Programmes. Since this waiver implies that mutually beneficial transactions through these programmes can take place, it will continue and we regard this as a positive development. We have always maintained that the unilateral restrictions against India were and are unjustified and they are counter-productive and they should be lifted in totality. Now, there was a question regarding the IMET programme, that is, military education and training. No, Sir, India is not participating in the IMET; though I do not share entirely the reservations that you have about the IMET programme. India has ealier participated and it has benefited the officers of the Indian Armed Forces and the US officers have also come and trained with us. So, military education and training by itself is, *per se* not bad. But, we are not going to participate in that programme as yet because this we consider in the Ministry as a selective or piecemeal application of laws or treatment to India. A question regarding greenhouse gases was put by hon. Ramachandran Pillai. I wish to just refer to it and it will take me only a minute, Sir, because if you see the statement that I have laid on the Table of the House, I think, it is a very satisfactory joint statement on cooperation in energy sector that is being signed between Mr. Bill Richardson and me and in that joint statement itself it is mentioned, "As the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases, the United States recognises its responsibilities to help lead international efforts to address the challenge of climate change." If in a joint statement the US mentions this, then I do not think there is any such fear as has been expressed by the hon. Member. This is really all that I have to say. I think I have answered the questions...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: But, one question remains. What about the removing of restrictions on transfer of high American technology, particularly the dual technology which is very important for us?...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, Sir, we recognise what you all dual use or cutting edge or high-tech items. That is why I did answer your question and did answer the hon. Member's question. But, I answered it in the language that I chose; till then we do not accept the selective application of sanctions, I have made it categorical and what I said here was that we have always maintained that unilateral restrictions against India are unjustified and counter-productive and should be lifted in totality.